



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,025	01/30/2007	Gereon Vogtmeier	PHDE030403US	1832
38107 7590 06/10/2008 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS 595 MINER ROAD CLEVELAND, OH 44143			EXAMINER ARTMAN, THOMAS R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2882	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/10/2008	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/596,025	<b>Applicant(s)</b> VOGTMEIER, GEREON	
	<b>Examiner</b> THOMAS R. ARTMAN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2882	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 May 2006 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5/25/2006</u> .   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Priority***

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on May 5<sup>th</sup>, 2008, is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner. Please see the attached PTO-1449.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 1-13 are generally narrative, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. Such errors include narrative phrases including "as well as" (claim 1), "can be" (claim 3), etc. Such errors also include idiomatic errors including "electro-optical respectively the opto-electrical" (claim 4), etc.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 6 is additionally objected to for having a broad range "a detector chip" followed by a narrower range "especially a CMOS chip" which is confusing. The broader of the ranges will be considered. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Vekstein (US 5,134,639).

Regarding claims 1 and 12, Vekstein discloses a CT device having a detector arrangement (Fig.1), including:

- a) at least one detector module 18 having a plurality of individual detector elements,
- b) an electrical unit 23, 24 for processing the signals of the detector elements, and
- c) an electro-optical transducer 26a-26d for generating optical detector module output signals.

With respect to claim 3, Vekstein further discloses that the electrical unit has an opto-electrical transducer 37a and 37b that supplies input signals to the detector modules 18 (col.6, lines 31-34).

With respect to claim 4, Vekstein further discloses that the opto-electrical transducers include photodiodes 53 and that the electro-optical transducers include LEDs 51.

With respect to claim 6, it is inherent in Vekstein that the detector modules have a detector chip upon which the detector elements are formed.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vekstein, as applied to claim 1 above.

Vekstein additionally discloses that the electrical unit (23, 24 and 26a-26d) includes a parallel-to-serial converter 24 for generating a serial detector module output signal.

Vekstein does not specifically disclose that the electrical unit includes an ADC. However, Vekstein does teach that an ADC is included in the electrical units 28a and 28b in order to digitize the detector signals for input to the image processor.

One skilled in the art will readily appreciate that the signal to noise ratio of digital data is inherently better than analogue signals.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Vekstein to include ADCs in the electrical unit in order to transmit the detector signals in digital form, rather than analogue. The improved signal to noise ratio thus improves the integrity of the data, as is known in the art.

Claims 5, 7-11 and 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vekstein, as applied to claims 1, 6 and 12 above, respectively, in view of Tsang et al. (Ref#2 from IDS filed May 25<sup>th</sup>, 2006).

With respect to claim 13, Vekstein additionally discloses that the detector arrangement 18 is arranged on a rotatable part of a gantry, the processing unit 29/33 is arranged in a stationary configuration, where the detectors and processing unit communicate wirelessly via optical means.

With respect to all the above claims, and further regarding claim 13, Vekstein does not additionally disclose that the electrical unit is integrated with the detector module, thus requiring that the detector modules are coupled to optical fibers, where the communications operate through an optical fiber infrastructure.

Tsang specifically teaches the practice of integrating electro-optic transducers with detector module electronics (Fig.11(c)) in order to transfer the detector data through optical fiber infrastructures, rather than copper wires, in order to improve the detector modules in several ways: reduced mass-volume since optical fibers are lighter than copper wires; improve bandwidth, which reduces the number of wires/fibers needed and thus allows for faster sampling rates; immunity to EMF and other sources of noise; and provide a high radiation resistance (col.2 of pp.3844). The integration of the electro-optic devices with the detector modules eliminates the massive amount of electronic devices and cables (col.1 of pp.3853). Tsang further discloses the use of an optical fiber backplane (Fig.3) for forming the optical connections.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Vekstein to use optical fiber-based communications with electro-optic transducers

Art Unit: 2882

integrated with the detector modules, in order to realize the myriad benefits of optical fiber-based communication.

Further regarding claim 8, for the electro-optic device to be integrated, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the module carrier has space for the electrical unit and a duct for the optical fiber.

Further regarding claim 9, slidable detector modules along rails, where at least one of the rails provides power to the detector module, is well known to the skilled artisan and an obvious modification to the typical detector structure of Vekstein.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Streckmann (US 4,401,360) teaches the practice of using optical fiber communication backbones on either side of an optical slip ring.

Banks (US 5,185,675) teaches the advantages of optical fiber communication backbones.

Watanabe (US 5,336,897), Hamada (US 6,718,005 B2) and Kruger (US 4,466,695) teach various optical slip rings, where the slip ring of Kruger has an optical fiber interface, and the slip rings of Watanabe and Hamada are implemented for data transfer in x-ray CT systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS R. ARTMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-2485. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 5:30pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ed Glick can be reached on (571) 272-2490. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thomas R Artman/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2882

Thomas R Artman  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2882